

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action mailed August 28, 2003, with a shortened statutory period of three months set to expire November 28, 2003. Claims 1-10 are currently pending.

The Examiner objected to the specification because of informalities on page 5 and page 7. The specification has been amended to correct these typographical errors. Therefore, this objection is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating that Unicode is not a font but rather a font encoding. This claim has been amended. Therefore, this rejection is believed to be overcome.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,167,013 issued to *Hube*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Applicants describe comparing character information that includes both the character code as well as font information. Character information is compared for each character in an electronic document. The character information, including character code and font information, may be replaced for each character based on a comparison table.

Hube describe a single font that is used for printing an entire document. *Hube* does not describe comparing character information for each character. *Hube* does not describe replacing character information for each character. *Hube* describe merely changing from one font, such as Times New Roman 12 point, to a different font, such as Times New Roman 10 point, when printing an entire document. Because *Hube* does not describe, teach, or suggest (1) comparing character information for each character, or (2) comparing character information that includes both character code and font information, *Hube* does not render Applicants' claims unpatentable.

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* in view of U.S. Patent 6,426,751 issued to *Patel*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Patel describes font feature file processing. The Examiner states that *Hube* does not describe inputting font object information to describe rule set to limit objects of

character comparison and a rule set related to mapping for each kanji radical. The Examiner further states that *Patel* disclosed the use of glyphName to glyphID mappings.

However, the combination of *Hube* and *Patel* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character or comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with inputting a font object information to describe a rule set to limit objects of character comparison and a rule set related to mapping for each kanji radical.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* and *Patel* and further in view of “Item-Mapping Subsystem”, IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin *IBMTDB*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 describe outputting weighting information regarding mapping between similar character codes in a reference file. The combination of *Hube*, *Patel*, and *IBMTDB* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information for each character or comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with outputting weighting information regarding mapping between similar character codes in a reference file.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* and *Patel* in view of U.S. Patent 6,360,223 issued to *Ng*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 describes comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font. The combination of *Hube*, *Patel*, and *Ng* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font.

The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube*, *Patel*, and *Ng* in view of U.S. Patent 5,257,323 issued to *Melen*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 describes character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font and in combination with adding priority level information for the plurality of character codes within the target font.

The combination of *Hube*, *Patel*, *Ng* and *Melen* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with a comparison table candidate list that takes as its elements groups comprising one character code within a source font and character codes within a target font compatible with the source font and in combination with adding priority level information for the plurality of character codes within the target font.

The Examiner rejected claim 6 under 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* in view of *Ng*.

Claim 6 describes comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with the comparison table being a list taking as elements a corresponding relationship between a group of a source font set and character code within this source font set and a group of a target font set and character code within this target font set. The combination of *Hube* and *Ng* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with the comparison table being a list taking as elements a corresponding relationship between a group of a source font set and character code within this source font set and a group of a target font set and character code within this target font set..

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hube* in view of U.S. Patent 6,389,178 issued to *Agazzi*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 describes the step of comparing being carried out automatically using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology. The combination of *Hube* and *Agazzi* does not describe, teach, or suggest comparing character information that includes both character code and font information in combination with the step of comparing being carried out automatically using Optical Character Recognition (OCR) technology.

The combination of references does not describe teach or suggest (1) comparing character information for each character in an electronic document, or (2) comparing character information that includes both character code and font information. Therefore, it is respectfully urged that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 12.01.03

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 367-2001
Attorney for Applicants